

## REMARKS

### Specification

The specification has been amended to correct typographical and/or grammatical errors. No new matter has been introduced.

### Drawings

The drawings were amended in order to correct inconsistencies with the specification. No new matter has been introduced.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibayama(US 6,111,448) in view of Albu et al.(US 6,043,677).

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP §2142.

Claim 1 of the present invention has been amended to teach “a reference delay line ... coupled through an inverter programmably disposed in series with said reference delay line” and “a feedback delay line ... coupled through an inverter programmably disposed in series with said feedback delay line”.

Neither Shibayama nor Albu teach the limitations of a reference delay line or a feedback delay line “coupled through an inverter” as taught in Claim 1 of the present invention. In fact, in the parent application (Serial No. 09/519,311) of the present application, the claims were allowed over the same §103 rejection based on Shibayama and Albu once the above-mentioned limitations relating to the reference and feedback delay lines were included in Applicant’s Amendment dated August 19, 2003. Examiner

responded to Applicant's Amendment with a Notice of Allowance dated October 21, 2003.

Furthermore, the delay lock loop, as taught in Claim 1 of the present invention and described in the specification (Page 6, Paragraph 21), has programmable connections which allow the delay lock loop to have multiple operating modes and feedback paths. Neither Shibayama nor Albu teach such programmably selectable connections between the components of the delay lock loop.

Applicant respectfully submits that Shibayama and Albu fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of Claim 1 of the present invention. Claim 1 is currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Newly Presented Claims

Newly presented claims 2-12 are supported by the specification and do not constitute new matter.

Independent claim 7 is patentable for the same reasons as stated above for Claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-6 are also patentable as they include all the limitations of parent claim 1.


Dependent claims 8-12 are also patentable as they include all the limitations of parent claim 7.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-12 are currently in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, the Examiner may telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500.

Respectfully submitted,  
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: October 15, 2004



Kenneth D'Alessandro  
Reg. No.: 29,144

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.  
P.O. Box 6149  
Stateline, NV 89449  
(775) 586-9500  
(775) 586-9550 Fax

In the Drawings

FIG. 7C has an output pad “50” added in the upper right-hand corner.

FIG. 7E has a change on the upper right-hand corner in which the lower occurrence of 50-1 has been changed to “50-2”<sup>1</sup>

FIGs. 7C and 7E are submitted herewith with these changes marked in red. These changes are necessary to make the drawings consistent with the specification. No new matter is added.